

BW401

II 3

MORE WORK FOR DR. WARREN.

DEAR DOCTOR,—As your case and conduct raise such great excitement in many bosoms, I assure you I feel a considerable share in my own heart; and it excites some interesting inquiries in my mind, which I cannot resolve so comfortably to my own wishes as I could like. No doubt but you can,—*your age—your piety—your talents*, as especially your *title* as LL. D., will very readily do it. I can answer some of my own questions promptly and categorically, but perhaps they are not the same as you will give. I will, therefore, seriously and religiously give you my own queries and answers.

Query 1st.: Do *innocency, justice, and truth* shrink and run away from the investigation of their principles or practice? I answer, Never!—What is yours, Doctor?

Query 2d.: Do not *innocency, justice, and truth*, when suspected, always *court* inquiry; nay, peremptorily demand it? I answer, Always!—What reply do you make, Doctor?

Query 3d.: When you were summoned by your brethren to give an account of your principles and practice in publishing your pamphlet, did you *court* inquiry? Did you stand before your brethren with holy confidence, because your principles and practices were surrounded by the halo of glory which always rests upon the brow of *innocency, justice, and truth*? I answer, Yes! you stood for a while, but afterwards slunk away! I suppose, Doctor, *your* reply will be nearly the same?

Query 4th.: Why did you retire from the investigation, when you knew that *innocency, justice, and truth* always come from the furnace of the severest trial like “gold seven times purified?” I cannot answer this question to my own satisfaction—what do you say, Doctor? I suppose you will reply, “Because my friend Bromley was commanded to retire, therefore I thought it my duty to retire also.” Very well,

But, 5thly: Would Mr. B.'s presence have made any alteration in the *nature* and essence of the justice and truth of your cause? Two and two make four, and can any man make them more or less? I answer they cannot. What is your answer, Doctor? I presume it will be “When Mr.

Wes. 1520

Bromley retired I had not *another friend* in court, and therefore I retired also." Very well.

6thly : Did St. Paul *run away* from his trial because he had not one human friend in the court? No. He stood alone, with all the composure of perfect self-possession, because he had justice and truth on his side; and you know, when he writes to Timothy, and gives an account of his trial, he says, "Though all men forsook me, the Lord stood with me and *strengthened me*." Dear Doctor, when Mr. B. was gone did the *Lord also go with him*, and leave his innocent servant Warren both *defenceless* and *strengthless* before his brethren? You can best answer that question.

Therefore, 7thly: If you were convinced that you had justice and truth on your side, could you not have stood *single handed*, not only before a District Meeting of your *brethren*, but before the clamours of an accusing world? I answer, Yes! What is your reply, Doctor?

Then I ask again, 8thly: What scriptural account can you give for escaping from investigation? I cannot find *one*. Perhaps you may find many.

I have thought that if a similar case had happened amongst the officers of a regiment of the British army (though I do not say that the cases between the army and the church of Christ are exactly parallel, yet I may fairly use it as an illustration). Supposing a Captain in a regiment had vilified and slandered the character of some of his brother officers, and had treated with derision their deliberations and decisions upon a certain important point, of establishing an institution to improve the qualifications of the junior officers when they entered into the lists and joined the regiment; and the Captain also wrote a very inflammatory appeal to the Serjeants and Corporals, and every common soldier in the ranks, and called upon them to oppose their officers.

I ask, 9thly: Would the officers in that regiment have done wrong in calling such a Captain to a *Court-martial*, to investigate the case, and desire him to vindicate himself? I think every person would say, No.

10thly. But supposing, at the court martial, an officer from a considerable distance, who had no legal right to be there, but was admitted by pure courtesy to be a mere *spectator* and *hearer*; but, when this gentleman entered the room, he sat down and immediately took a very officious and improper *interference* in the case of the Captain, and when the officers

wished him to be still, and desired him to take his place, where a *spectator* and a *hearer* ought to be, this officious gentleman breathed out a fiery dart of the most wounding reflection upon his brother officers, and called their conduct "*consummately cruel*." I ask, Was this proper language to come out of the mouth of a person who had *no right to be there* ! but by the kindness of those very officers whose conduct he was libelling as being "*consummately cruel*?" I answer, the conduct and the answer of that gentleman would have been equally improper. What do you say, Doctor ?

11thly : Supposing the officers had interfered, and said that as their brother had taken such improper liberties to interfere in a case where he had no legitimate right, and also cast reflections upon them as "*consummately cruel*," they begged therefore that he would *entirely withdraw*, would any one have blamed them ? I presume to answer, No. What would have been your views of such a case ?

12thly : If when the over-officious and hard-judging brother had retired, the Captain also *withdrew with him*, what would the officers have concluded from such conduct ? I think they would have expressed their fears that the Captain *must be guilty*, or he would never have insulted the Court, and thus slunk away from his trial. I think such a conclusion quite natural ! Perhaps, Doctor, you do not.

13thly : But if the Court deputed some officers to go to the Captain and beg that he would stand the investigation, and meet them the *next day*, and assure him that if he was clear he had no grounds to fear, that "*great was truth and would prevail*," but the Captain still poured contempt upon the *Court* and the *Deputation*—was it improper, nay, was it not kind in the officers, after he appeared *incorrigible*, to suspend him *a month* from the exercise of the functions of his office, in order that he might have time to deliberate upon the subject ? I think every one would have approved of the conduct of the officers ! Perhaps, Doctor, you think differently.

14thly : If in the interval of the month, instead of seriously and silently considering the subject, and, at the end of the term, coming with humble boldness to meet his brethren (as an innocent injured man would do), he filled up that interval by holding seditious meetings, and disseminating the most inflammatory speeches and principles among the soldiers, and told them that he was their Captain

still; that he was appointed by the king, and his name regularly gazetted; that the court-martial could not suspend him, and he earnestly called every man in the regiment to make common cause with him against their officers as deep and downright tyrants—would not any man in the British army have thought that, if he did not ask pardon, and promise amendment, he richly deserved to be cashiered? Would not Dr. Warren think so?

15thly: But supposing the suspended Captain, *who durst not stand his trial*, took it upon him also to legislate for the whole British army, and introduce perfectly new rules and regulations, which will subvert the principles of the discipline of the army, and injure its unity, harmony, and strength. I ask, would *such a Captain* be the most proper man to legislate in such a case? I answer, emphatically, No! Is that a proper man to make laws for others, who breaks all law himself? I again repeat it, No! He is certainly the most improper man in the world for such a work. Perhaps on this point you will think differently.

And now, Doctor, you see the bearing of the above questions as applicable to your case, and I think they deserve the most serious consideration and unambiguous answers.—O, Sir, my soul bleeds for the church of Christ; and, when I see the *children*, and *members*, and *Ministers* of Methodism, as far as they are able, thrust the sword into the bowels of *their parent*, who “nourished and brought them up,” my soul “weeps in secret places;” and I mourn over the men who can make the slightest approach towards that awful character for which St. Paul says the law is made, viz., murderers of fathers and murderers of mothers; and, Sir, what is to become of their children? For Christ’s sake and souls’ sake stop in your career of scattering, tearing, and slaying the flock of our Great Shepherd. That the wolf should do it is not to be wondered at, but for an *under shepherd* to do it is monstrous. Lord, save us from ourselves is the cry of the heart of—

Yours sincerely,

W. DAWSON.

Barnbow (near Leeds), 16 Dec. 1834